

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

'Strangers in Their Own Land': Development and Validation of a Balanced, Unidimensional Scale to Measure the Sense of Threat to Local Traditions

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1734880> since 2021-12-13T18:26:28Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1093/ijpor/edz009

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

**'Strangers in Their Own Land': Development and Validation
of a Balanced, Unidimensional Scale to Measure the Sense
of Threat to Local Traditions**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Public Opinion Research</i>
Manuscript ID	IJPOR-2018-143.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Note
Keyword list:	globalization, symbolic threat, measurement
Keywords:	scale, cultural threat, psychological orientation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Abstract

In recent decades, individuals and communities all over the world have experienced drastic and rapid societal changes due to economic, social, cultural and political cross-national interconnections. At present, a convincing scale measuring people’s perception of threat deriving from these societal changes is not available. In this study, we have developed and validated the Sense of Threat to Local Traditions (SETLOT) Scale with a quota sample of 1,548 Italian adults. The SETLOT Scale is composed of six 4-category items and is balanced against response set. After correcting for the acquiescent response set, the scale is unidimensional and has a good convergent validity. Strengths and limitations of this study and possible uses of the SETLOT Scale are discussed.

‘Strangers in Their Own Land’: Development and Validation of a Balanced, Unidimensional Scale to Measure the Sense of Threat to Local Traditions

Individuals and communities all over the world are experiencing rapid societal changes due to economic, social, cultural and political cross-national interconnections. Social scientists agree on the importance of understanding the psychological, social and cultural implications of this globalization process (Diaz & Zirchler, 2012; Scholte, 2005). These analyses cannot ignore the reaction of people who feel threatened in their consolidated social practices by the growing exposure to the symbolic cues of social changes, leading them to feel like ‘strangers in their own land’ (Hochschild, 2016). However, a solid and convincing scale measuring people’s perception of threat to local traditions does not exist. This hinders a solid test of this psychological consequence of globalization. To fill this gap, we developed and validated the Sense of Threat to Local Traditions (SETLOT) Scale with a wide quota sample of the Italian adult population.

Globalization as a Source of Psychological Threat

One of the crucial aspects of globalization is the upsurge of migration flows and the opportunity for different ethnic groups to meet each other. In Italy, where we carried out the present research, this phenomenon was extremely sudden and even more salient than in other European countries. Two categories of psychological responses were observed: optimistic and integrative reactions on the one hand, and exclusionary and defensive reactions on the other (Chiu & Kwan, 2016).

Citizens leaning towards an integrative orientation welcomed migrant flows and the weakening of economic and political borders as a possibility to enlarge economic opportunities, enrich local cultures, spread modernity and enhance the acceptance of universal values of human rights, freedom and democracy. For other citizens, a perception of cultural contamination and a fear of downward competition among workers and of erosion of local cultural traditions prevailed, leading to the desire of defending and reaffirming local traditional practices (Chiu, Gries, Torelli, & Cheng, 2011).

1
2
3 1 Outside the US, beyond concern for migration flows, global society’s Americanization is
4
5 2 another relevant aspect contributing to this bewilderment (Scholte, 2005). The emerging global
6
7 3 culture is less a synthesis of different traditions than the affirmation of one dominant culture over
8
9 4 others (Beck, Sznaider, & Winter, 2003). American values, language and products (from movies to
10
11 5 foods) are regarded as desirable by an ever-increasing number of people, and through the younger
12
13 6 generations, the American lifestyle is reproduced everywhere in the world, often to the detriment of
14
15 7 local culture (e.g., Waters, 1996). However, US cultural hegemony has also encountered resistance
16
17 8 in Europe, Asia and South America (Chiu & Hong, 2006).
18
19
20
21 9 The cultural upheaval embodied in the increasing salience of unfamiliar customs, habits and
22
23 10 symbols feeds into many people’s sense of feeling like ‘strangers in their own land’ (Hochschild,
24
25 11 2016). New media technologies can reinforce this feeling, freeing and disseminating individual
26
27 12 moods previously confined to the private sphere. This reflects what is currently happening in
28
29 13 Western countries, where immigrants of different ethnic origins are settling down in ethno-
30
31 14 culturally homogeneous contexts (Ha & Jang, 2015). In this case, the perceived threats associated to
32
33 15 social change derive from the heightened competition for material resources (economic threat),
34
35 16 from the forced cultural mash-up (symbolic threat) and from the concern for public safety (social
36
37 17 threat) (Stephan, Renfro, Esses, Stephan, & Martin, 2005).
38
39
40
41 18 Many researchers have analysed the consequences of such perceptions mainly in terms of attitude
42
43 19 towards immigrants (e.g., Caricati, Mancini, & Marletta, 2017), political orientations (e.g., Kinder
44
45 20 & Sears, 1981) and support for specific policies (e.g., Scheepers, Gijsberts, & Coenders, 2002). In
46
47 21 addition, beyond strengthening political leaning to conservatism (Louis, Duck, Terry, & Lalonde,
48
49 22 2010), the nostalgic reaction of people feeling that traditional values and norms are challenged fuels
50
51 23 their proneness towards populism and the voting for populist parties (e.g., Hawkins, Read, &
52
53 24 Pauwels, 2017).
54
55
56
57
58 25 However, the extant measures do not allow researchers to capture the cultural disorientation
59
60 26 citizens may experience due to the changes stemming from globalization.

1 The Cultural Threats

Economic threat is linked to the autochthonous individuals' belief that immigrants usurp jobs and social resources needed for native-born individuals (e.g., Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998), and social threat derives from the perception that immigrants are often involved in criminal activities (e.g., Wang, 2012), but the cultural threat is a more complex and multifaceted concept (Diaz & Zirkel, 2012).

One facet of this concept is captured by the notion of symbolic threat stemming from the forced contact between culturally distant ethnic groups, which leads people to perceive a challenge to previously established and shared worldviews, values and traditions (Stephan & Stephan, 2013). Symbolic threat elicits hostility and discrimination towards outgroups (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006), individual proneness to populist political offers (e.g., Hawkins, Read, & Pauwels, 2017) and political leaning to conservatism (e.g., Bornschier, 2018).

Symbols play an important role in the perception of this conflict, since cultural threat is triggered by the juxtaposition or the alignment of minority and dominant cultures (Rosenmann, Reese, & Cameron, 2016). When symbols of different social practices or traditions (e.g., foods, clothes, religious objects and holidays) are exposed simultaneously, 'culture' becomes the salient category people use to interpret the social world (Chiu & Cheng, 2010). Thus, the cognitive co-activation of cultures fosters the perception of intercultural differences and of social cohesion that, in turn, orients the individual expression of culturally stereotypic preferences (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000).

Another relevant dimension likely to foster cultural disorientation is the feeling of national nostalgia. This typically emerges in periods of social changes as an expression of resistance to the new situation, which can be contrasted to the good, socially homogeneous and lost past (Rapport & Dawson, 1998). This shared emotion promotes prejudice towards immigrants as a way to defend collective identity (Smeekes, Verkuyten, & Martinovic, 2015) and, at the same time, attenuates inter-subgroup competition in name of a supra-ordinate identity (Martinovic, Jetten, Smeekes, &

1
2
3 1 Verkuyten, 2018). Therefore, national nostalgia *per se* does not capture the genuine negative feeling
4
5 2 of threat to traditions elicited by the exposure to social change symbols. Traditions are sources of
6
7 3 meaning concretely embodying values and collective identity, which in turn root the actor within a
8
9 4 coherent and meaningful context. As consolidated social practices, traditions become implicit social
10
11 5 norms about ‘our’ way to face social objects. Thus, feeling the decline of traditions could translate
12
13 6 into a sense of *anomie*, the term Durkheim (1893) coined to refer to a state of alienation and
14
15 7 normlessness. According to Hawkins et al. (2017), there has still not been an adequate clarification
16
17 8 of the role of anomie in promoting the social-psychological consequences of the globalization
18
19 9 turmoil.

20
21
22
23
24 10 **Measuring the Perceived Threat to Local Traditions**

25
26 11 The goal of the SETLOT Scale is to tap the generalized perceived threat brought about by
27
28 12 the current cultural and societal changes, thus overcoming two limitations of the extant scales. First,
29
30 13 the specific relational (i.e., intergroup) definition of the symbolic threat notion leads most of its
31
32 14 operational definitions to mention explicitly the immigrants as the threat source, thus narrowing
33
34 15 substantially the focus of the possible studies (Riek et al., 2006). Moreover, the measures of
35
36 16 symbolic threat fail to address other aspects of the cultural threat deriving from globalization and
37
38 17 affirmation of American lifestyles in other countries. Second, the concept of national nostalgia fails
39
40 18 to capture a genuine sense of discontentment about social and cultural changes as witnessed by the
41
42 19 items of Smeekes et al.’s (2015) scale (e.g., ‘How often do you bring to mind nostalgic experiences
43
44 20 related to the way the Netherlands was in the past?’).

45
46
47
48
49 21 We contend that a measure of the sense of threat to local traditions caused by the current
50
51 22 social change would be an important tool for integrating the operational definition of the symbolic
52
53 23 threat and of national nostalgia, able to contribute to a fine-grained understanding of the public
54
55 24 opinion of the present social change.

56
57
58 25 **The Present Study**

59
60 26 **Goals and Hypotheses**

We aimed to develop and validate the SETLOT Scale by testing its factorial structure and its convergent validity. The criteria for developing the scale were the following. From the substantive point of view, we worded items referring to ‘social changes’ without any further specification of threat sources (e.g., immigrants). From the methodological point of view, we aimed to develop a short, unidimensional and balanced scale.

Based on the literature above, we expected the SETLOT Scale to show positive associations with: (a) negative attitude towards immigrants (H1); (b) populist orientation (H2); (c) voting for populist parties (H3); and (d) political conservatism (H4).

Method

Context

We performed this study within the 2018 ‘Italian National Election Studies’ (Itanes: see <http://www.itanes.org/en/>) research on the political attitudes and voting behaviour of Italians in the 2018 national election.

Participants and Procedure

Via email (using the Computer-Assisted Web Interviews method), we surveyed a quota sample composed of 1,548 Italians over 18 years old (men = 46.3%, $M_{age} = 47.52$, $SD = 13.16$), stratified according to gender, age, geographic area of residence and size of area of residence. As an average, our sample declared 14.17 years of formal education ($SD = 3.23$). In terms of geographic area of residence, 24.2%, 21.4%, 20.7%, 22.3% and 11.4% of the participants, respectively, lived in North-Western Italy, North-Eastern Italy, Central Italy, Southern Italy and on the main Italian islands (Sicily and Sardinia). A total of 34.9% of the respondents lived in large towns (>100,000 inhabitants), while the other 65.1% lived in smaller population centres.

Measures

We used the following set of questions, taken from a larger questionnaire available from the corresponding author.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Sense of Threat to Local Traditions Scale. We constructed a concise, balanced scale,

composed of six items, reflecting what can be heard from people’s discussions about the current social change. Three statements are focused on traditions being under attack and negative consequences, while the other three are focused on potential benefits of the evolution and integration of customs. Respondents had to rate each statement as ‘very true’, ‘somewhat true’, ‘a little true’, or ‘not true at all’. Table 1 reports the Italian version of the items, their English translation and the factorial loadings stemming from confirmatory factor analyses (see below).

Attitude towards immigrants was measured via three items. First, ‘Would you say it is generally bad or good for Italy’s economy that people come to live here from other countries?’ Second, ‘Would you say it is generally bad or good for Italy’s culture that people come to live here from other countries?’ Third, ‘Some people say that we receive too many immigrants. Others say that we can receive many more. Suppose these people are at the extreme of the following scale. Of course, others have intermediate opinions. Where would you place your opinion?’ We took the first two items from the European Social Survey (ESS: see www.europeansocialsurvey.org) and the third from the 2013 ITANES post-electoral survey (see http://www.itanes.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/ITA2013_QuestionnaireCAPI_English_2014_08_07.pdf). Based on $\alpha = .85$, we averaged them, after recoding them all to a 0–1 range to give them the same unit of measurement (originally, the first two items had an 11-category response format and the third a 7-category response format). High scores indicated a negative attitude towards immigrants.

Populist orientation. We measured participants’ populist orientation using Akkerman, Mudde, and Zaslove’s (2013) scale, composed of eight 5-category items, such as ‘The people, and not politicians, should make our most important policy decisions’ and ‘I would rather be represented by a citizen than by a specialized politician’. Based on $\alpha = .87$, we averaged them into a populist orientation index. High scores showed high levels of populist orientation.

Voting for a populist party. Based on Corbetta, Colloca, Cavazza, and Roccato (2018), according to which the 5 Star Movement and the League are the most populist Italian parties, we

recoded the answers to the question asking participants which party they voted for in the 2018 election into a dummy variable, contrasting voters for a non-populist party, coded as 0 ($n = 461$), with voters for the 5 Star Movement ($n = 432$) and for the League ($n = 148$), coded as 1. Respondents who did not report a valid vote were excluded from this variable.

Political conservatism. We operationalized participants' conservatism via the standard ESS 11-category item asking participants about their political placement: 'In politics people sometimes talk of left and right. Where would you place yourself on this scale, where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?'

Data analyses

We validated the SETLOT Scale via a twofold procedure. First, we tested its factorial structure through a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). According to the literature, especially when surveying samples from the general population, a distortion stemming from the acquiescent response set is likely. From the multivariate point of view, this phenomenon can bias the results, in that a genuinely unidimensional scale can appear as bi-dimensional (Winkler, Kanouse, & Ware, 1984). When, as in our case, the scale is balanced, CFA allows correction of such a distortion by employing the correlated uniqueness (CU) approach (Marsh, 1989), which correlates the errors of the con-trait items to control for the error variance stemming from the response set. Thus, we remained open to testing the dimensionality of the SETLOT Scale via a two-step procedure without resorting to the CU approach, and then, if needed, by resorting to such an approach. As a second step, we tested the convergent validity of the SETLOT Scale. Based on the literature above, we expected the SETLOT Scale (measured as a latent variable) to be positively associated with a negative attitude towards immigrants, with participants' populist orientation, with voting for a populist party and with political conservatism. We tested the fit of our models by analysing the *TLI*, the *CFI* and the *RMSEA*. We considered the *TLI* and the *CFI* satisfactory if $> .90$ and the *RMSEA* if $< .08$ (Bentler, 1990; Browne & Cudeck, 1993).

Results

1
2
3 1 Table 2 reports the descriptive statistics of the variables we used and their bivariate
4
5 2 correlations.

6
7
8 3 **Factorial Structure of the Sense of Threat to Local Traditions Scale**

9
10 4 A first CFA led to unsatisfactory results. As Table 1 (penultimate column) shows, all the
11
12 5 factorial loadings of the scale were shown to be significant. However, the fit of the model was not
13
14 6 satisfactory: $TLI = .56$, $CFI = .74$, $RMSEA = .20$ (90% $CI = .19, .22$). Consistent with this: (a) the
15
16 7 bivariate correlations between the pro-trait and between the con-trait items were systematically
17
18 8 higher than those between the pro-trait and the con-trait items, and two of the latter were even non-
19
20 9 significant (see Table 3); and (b) the α of the scale was under the usual threshold, $\alpha = .67$.

21
22
23
24 10 However, a second CFA, performed by resorting to the CU approach, led to completely
25
26 11 satisfactory results. Indeed, all the factorial loadings remained significant (see the last column of
27
28 12 Table 1). Moreover, the associations between the con-trait items also reached statistical
29
30 13 significance, with r 's ranging from $r = .30$ to $r = .43$, and all p 's $< .001$, demonstrating the need to
31
32 14 correct for the bias stemming from the acquiescent response set. Finally, the indices of fit of the
33
34 15 model passed all the thresholds: $TLI = .96$, $CFI = .98$, $RMSEA = .06$ (90% $CI = .05, .08$). The
35
36 16 Average Variance Extracted (AVE) index was $= .49$, while the composite reliability (CR) was $=$
37
38 17 $.65$.¹

39
40
41
42 18 Based on two other CFAs, we could exclude a bi-factorial structure. Indeed, the fit of a bi-
43
44 19 factorial model, with the con-traits loading on one factor and the con-trait items on the other, led to
45
46 20 worse fit indices – $TLI = .87$, $CFI = .92$, $RMSEA = .11$ (90% $CI = .10, .12$), even when we freed the
47
48 21 correlation between the two factors: $TLI = .90$, $CFI = .95$, $RMSEA = .11$ (90% $CI = .08, .11$). The
49
50 22 much lower AIC and BIC of our model ($AIC = 70.971$, $BIC = 71.107$) as compared to those of the
51
52 23 first ($AIC = 201.538$, $BIC = 201.647$) and the second ($AIC = 148.206$, $BIC = 217.687$) bi-
53
54 24 dimensional models confirmed this conclusion. More analyses, available as supplementary material,
55
56 25 showed that the two factors of a bi-factorial model yielded substantially the same correlations with
57
58 26 the variable we used to test the SETLOT's convergent validity (see the next paragraph). Thus, we

concluded that, after the correction of the factor method stemming from acquiescence, the SETLOT Scale had a unidimensional structure.

Convergent Validity of the Sense of Threat to Local Traditions Scale

Consistent with H1, the SETLOT Scale had a positive association with participants' negative attitude towards immigrants ($r = .69, p < .001$), both measured as latent variables: $TLI = .96, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .06$ (90% $CI = .05, .07$). Moreover, consistent with H2, the SETLOT Scale showed a positive correlation with participants' populist orientation, both measured as latent variables: $r = .43, TLI = .91, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .07$ (90% $CI = .06, .07$). Consistent with H3, the SETLOT Scale, measured as a latent variable, showed a positive point-biserial correlation with voting for a populist party: $r_{pb} = .23, p < .001, TLI = .96, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .05$ (90% $CI = .04, .07$). Finally, consistent with H4, the SETLOT Scale scores, measured as a latent variable, were positively correlated with political conservatism: $r = .53, p < .001, TLI = .93, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .07$ (90% $CI = .06, .09$). Thus, we concluded that the SETLOT Scale showed a satisfactory convergent validity.

Discussion

The psychological crux of globalization consequences is the sense of feeling like a 'stranger in one's own land' (Hochschild, 2016). This feeling has been conceptualized in social, psychological, sociological and political science literature mainly in terms of symbolic threat elicited by forced cohabitation with immigrants, or by national nostalgia encouraged by radical changes in the national culture. The extant research on the social implications of symbolic-cultural threat has been mostly limited, on the operational level, to the perception of the fight among fundamental and sometimes incompatible values. However, citizens' fear of change may be rooted in a sense of value threat, and values are embodied in a variety of different and new customs and habits that people observe as compared to a previously homogeneous social environment. The everyday exposure to concrete symbols (foods, religious items, clothes etc.) of different ways of life

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 activates the intergroup framework able to forge citizens’ political attitudes, feelings and
2 behaviours.

3 The aim of the present study was to provide a tool to capture this sense of threat to local
4 traditions. For this purpose, we developed the SETLOT Scale and validated it through a survey of a
5 sample of the Italian general population by testing its factorial structure and its convergent validity.
6 The SETLOT Scale consists of a short, unidimensional and balanced set of six items referring to the
7 emotional reluctance derived from custom evolution as opposed to the welcome of innovation and
8 social change.

9 Overall, the SETLOT Scale displays satisfactory psychometric properties. The CFA of the
10 initial item pool yielded one factor. The relationships between the criterion measures and the
11 SETLOT Scale confirmed the anticipated scale’s convergent validity. In line with our hypotheses,
12 the scale score was strongly associated to a negative attitude towards immigrants, even though none
13 of the items explicitly cite this issue. Moreover, the scale appeared to be associated to a number of
14 political attitudes that have been conceived as globalization consequences, such as populist
15 orientation, voting for populist parties and political conservatism.

16 This study was not without limitations. First, as with the other existing scales in this field of
17 study, we validated the SETLOT Scale with a population sample from a single nation. Future cross-
18 cultural research could explore the factorial stability of the scale across different cultures. Second, it
19 was administered using a CAWI approach only. A comparison of the SETLOT Scale’s performance
20 across different methods of administration could be interesting. Third, due to space limitations in
21 the questionnaire we used, we could not explore the scale’s unique predictive validity in
22 comparison to other scales. This exploration could represent another line of future research. Fourth,
23 the *AVE* (= .49) of the scale was slightly below the .50 threshold conventionally chosen to test the
24 convergent validity of a measurement model. However, according to Fornell and Larcker (1981),
25 the *CR* of the scale was high enough to conclude that the SETLOT’s items showed a satisfactory
26 convergent validity. Finally, the single factor of the SETLOT scale explained a low variance of two

con-trait items. New administrations of the SETLOT Scale could be interesting to test the inter-situational robustness of our unidimensional solution

Despite these limitations, the SETLOT Scale has some relevant advantages: it is a short scale consisting of six items only; it is balanced, thus it allows to correct the individual scores from participants' idiosyncratic use of the scale through structural equations modelling (Marsch, 1989); it is short and can therefore be used instead of, or as a complement for, other scales—e.g., Stephan, Stephan, and Gudkunst's (1999) symbolic threat scale and Smeekes et al.'s (2015) national nostalgia scale. We believe that the short and comprehensive nature of the SETLOT Scale will help facilitate the understanding of socially and politically relevant phenomena, such as inter-ethnic relations and technology acceptance. Moreover, because it does not mention outgroups as a source of threat (e.g., immigrants), it could be used extensively across different countries to expand our knowledge on the 'demand side' of populism as a reaction to undesired and incomprehensible social changes, allowing a methodologically convincing test of the 'cultural road' to populist orientations (e.g., Elchardus & Spruyt, 2016; Inglehart & Norris, 2016).

References

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Akkerman, A., Mudde, C., & Zaslove, A. (2013). How populist are the people? Measuring populist
2 attitudes in voters. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47, 1324-1353. doi:
3 10.1177/0010414013512600
4
5 Beck, U., Sznaider, N., & Winter, R. (Eds.) (2003). *Global America? The cultural consequences of*
6 *globalization* (Vol. 8). Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press.
7
8 Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107,
9 238-246. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
10
11 Bornschier, S. (2018). Globalization, cleavages, and the radical right. In J. Rydgren (Ed.), *The*
12 *Oxford handbook of the radical right* (pp. 212-238). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
13
14 Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J.
15 S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
16
17 Caricati, L., Mancini, T., & Marletta, G. (2017). The role of ingroup threat and conservative
18 ideologies on prejudice against immigrants in two samples of Italian adults. *The Journal of*
19 *Social Psychology*, 157, 86-97. doi: 10.1080/00224545.2016.1176552
20
21 Chiu, C. Y., & Cheng, S. Y. Y. (2010). Cultural psychology of globalization. In R. Schwarzer & P.
22 A. French (Eds.), *Personality, human development, and culture: International perspectives on*
23 *psychological science* (Vol. 2, pp. 199–212). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
24
25 Chiu, C. Y., & Hong, Y. Y. (2006). *Social psychology of culture*. New York, NY: Psychology
26 Press.
27
28 Chiu, C. Y., & Kwan, L. Y. Y. (2016). Globalization and psychology. *Current Opinions in*
29 *Psychology*, 8, 44-48. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.010
30
31 Chiu, C. Y., Gries, P., Torelli, C. J., & Cheng, S. Y. (2011). Toward a social psychology of
32 globalization. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67, 663-676. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01721.x

- Corbetta, P., Colloca, P., Cavazza, N., & Roccato, M. (2018). Lega and Five-star Movement voters: Exploring the role of cultural, economic and political bewilderment. *Contemporary Italian Politics*, 10, 279-293. doi: 10.1080/23248823.2018.1524678
- Diaz, J., & Zirkel, S. (2012). Globalization, psychology, and social issues research: An introduction and conceptual framework. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68, 439-453. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01757.x
- Durkheim, E. (1893). *The division of labor in society*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Elchardus, M., & Spruyt, B. (2016). Populism, persistent republicanism and declinism: An empirical analysis of populism as a thin ideology. *Government and Opposition*, 51, 111-133. doi: 10.1017/gov.2014.27
- Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54, 699-724. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01244.x
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50. doi: 10.2307/3151312
- Ha, S. E., & Jang, S. J. (2015). Immigration, threat perception, and national identity: Evidence from South Korea. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 44, 53-62. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.12.001 0147-1767
- Hawkins, K., Read, M., & Pauwels, T. (2017). Populism and its causes. In C. R. Kaltwasser, P. Taggart, P. O. Espejo, & P. Ostiguy (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of populism* (pp. 267-286). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hochschild, A. R. (2016). *Strangers in their own land: A journey to the heart of the American right*. New York, NY: New Press

- Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55, 709-720. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.7.709
- Inglehart, R. F., & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash. Harvard Kennedy School, RWP16-026. Retrieved 18 December 2017 from Harvard Kennedy School web site: <https://research.hks.harvard.edu/publications/workingpapers/Index.aspx>
- Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 414-431. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.40.3.414
- Louis, W. R., Duck, J. M., Terry, D. J., & Lalonde, R. N. (2010). Speaking out on immigration policy in Australia: Identity threat and the interplay of own opinion and public opinion. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66, 653-672. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01669.x
- Marsh, H. W. (1989). Confirmatory factor analyses of multitrait-multimethod data: Many problems and a few solutions. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 13, 335-361. doi: 10.1177/014662168901300402
- Martinovic, B., Jetten, J., Smeekes, A., & Verkuyten, M. (2018). Collective memory of a dissolved country: Group-based nostalgia and guilt assignment as predictors of interethnic relations between diaspora groups from former Yugoslavia. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 5, 588-607. doi: 10.5964/jspp.v5i2.733
- Rapport, N., & Dawson, A. (1998). *Migrants of identity: Perceptions of home in a world of movement*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 336-353. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_4

- 1
2
3 1 Rosenmann, A., Reese, G., & Cameron, J. E. (2016). Social identities in a globalized world:
4
5 2 Challenges and opportunities for collective action. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11,
6
7 3 202-221. doi: 10.1177/1745691615621272
8
9
10 4 Scheepers, P., Gijsberts, M., & Coenders, M. (2002). Ethnic exclusionism in European countries.
11
12 5 Public opposition to civil rights for legal migrants as a response to perceived ethnic
13
14 6 threat. *European Sociological Review*, 18, 17-34. doi: 10.1093/esr/18.1.17
15
16
17 7 Scholte, J. A. (2005). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. London, UK: Macmillan.
18
19 8 Smeekes, A., Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2015). Longing for the country's good old days:
20
21 9 National nostalgia, autochthony beliefs, and opposition to Muslim expressive rights. *British*
22
23 10 *Journal of Social Psychology*, 54, 561-580. doi: 10.1111/bjso.12097
24
25
26 11 Stephan, W. G., Renfro, C. L., Esses, V. M., Stephan, C. W., & Martin, T. (2005). The effects of
27
28 12 feeling threatened on attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural*
29
30 13 *Relations*, 29, 1-19. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.04.011
31
32
33 14 Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. S. (2013). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp
34
35 15 (Ed.) *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 33-56). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
36
37
38 16 Wang, X. (2012). Undocumented immigrants as perceived criminal threat: A test of the minority
39
40 17 threat perspective. *Criminology*, 50, 743-776. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2012.00278.x
41
42
43 18 Waters, M, (1996). McDonaldization and the global culture of consumption, *Sociale*
44
45 19 *Wetenschappen*, 39(4), 17-30.
46
47 20 Winkler, J. D., Kanouse, D. E., & Ware, L. E., Jr. (1982). Controlling for acquiescence response set
48
49 21 in scale development. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 555-561. doi: 10.1037/0021-
50
51 22 9010.67.5.555
52
53
54 23
55
56 24
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Footnote

¹The SETLOT scale’s *AVE* gave a result slightly under the usual .50 threshold. However, according to Fornell and Larcker (1981), a lower (even .40) threshold is acceptable if a scale’s *CR* is higher than .60, as in our case. Thus, we concluded that the items of the SETLOT Scale showed a satisfactory convergent validity.

For Peer Review

Table 1

The Sense of Threat to Local Traditions Scale: Items and Standardized Factorial Loadings

Item		Standardized factorial loadings	
Italian version	English version	Unidimensional model	Unidimensional model with the correlated uniqueness correction
1. Oggi in Italia le tradizioni sono minacciate come mai prima d'ora.	1. Today in Italy, traditions are under attack as never before.	.80***	.79***
2. I cambiamenti sociali sono più un miglioramento che una minaccia. (R)	2. The changes we see in society are an improvement rather than a threat to our tradition. (R)	.33***	.31***
3. Mi sento spesso uno straniero a casa mia.	3. I often feel like a stranger in my own country.	.60***	.60***
4. La nostra società dovrebbe rinunciare ad alcune tradizioni per adattarsi meglio ai tempi che corrono. (R)	4. We need to give up some traditions in order to adapt ourselves better to the times in which we live. (R)	.16***	.13***

5. I cambiamenti sociali stanno minando le nostre radici culturali.	5. The changes we see in society are threatening our very culture.	.82***	.83***
6. La nostra società dovrebbe dare più importanza all'innovazione che alle tradizioni. (R)	6. We need to give more importance to innovation rather than tradition. (R)	.13***	.10**

Note. (R) = reversed item. All the reversed items are recoded so that high scores indicate a high sense of threat to local traditions. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Our Variables and Bivariate Correlations between Them

	Descriptive statistics		Correlations				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5
1. SETLOT	2.57	.53	1	.57***	.31***	.19***	.34***
2. Attitude toward immigrants	6.04	2.33		1	.35***	.27***	.44***
3. Populist orientation	3.88	.75			1	.32***	.22***
4. Vote for a populist party	.37	.48				1	.14***

Note. SETLOT = Sense of threat to local traditions. Scale scores computed as average scores. The ‘mean’ of voting for a populist party is the proportion, on a 0–1 scale, of the respondents who voted for a populist party. When voting for a populist party is involved, the point-biserial correlation is displayed.

Table 3

Bivariate Correlations between the Items of the SETLOT Scale before the Correlated Uniqueness correction

	Item 1	Item 2 (R)	Item 3	Item 4 (R)	Item 5	Item 6 (R)
Item 1	1	.25***	.49***	.14***	.65***	.11***
Item 2 (R)		1	.15***	.33***	.29***	.31***
Item 3			1	-.01	.50***	-.02
Item 4 (R)				1	.10***	.44***
Item 5					1	.08***
Item 6 (R)						1

Note. (R) = reversed item. *** $p < .001$.

Supplementary online material

In this supplementary online material, we present some reasoning in favour of a unidimensional structure of the SETLOT Scale, and the results of our convergent validity tests performed using a bi-factorial model instead of the unidimensional model we chose to present in the paper.

Theoretical Reasoning Supporting a Unidimensional Solution

1. According to the literature, surveys performed with samples from the general population are often distorted by the acquiescent response set (e.g., Curran, 2016), in that inaccurate respondents are over-represented within such samples (e.g., McGrath et al., 2010), especially if surveyed via email (e.g., Johnson, 2005).
2. We had a relevant symptom of acquiescent response-set: A single-factor model of a battery conceived to be unidimensional did not fit well, but its fits improved significantly when resorting to the Correlated Uniqueness approach, developed to fix response-set issues (Marsh, 1989).
3. Consistent with this, as shown in the manuscript, the congeneric model fitted the data better than a bi-dimensional model with the pro-trait items loading on Factor 1 and the con-trait items loading on Factor 2, as consistently witnessed by the higher CFI and the TLI and the lower RMSEA of the first as compared to those of the second and by its much lower AIC and BIC.
4. Before resorting to the Correlated Uniqueness correction some items showed to be uncorrelated one to another (as shown in Table 3 in the manuscript). However, all of the factorial loadings of the congeneric model were statistically significant (as shown in Table 1 in the manuscript). Moreover, the non-significant bivariate correlations involved the pro-trait Item 3 on the one hand and the con-trait Item 4 and Item 6 on the other. This is far from surprising, in that—by definition—after reversing the con-trait items, the acquiescent response-set pushes some participants (those giving an acquiescent response-set) in a direction when responding the pro-trait items and in the opposite direction when responding the con-trait items. Consequently, in the case of distortion stemming from the acquiescent response-set, one should expect the mean correlation

between the pro-trait items to be higher than that between the con-trait items, and both of them to be higher than the mean correlation between the pro-trait and the con-trait items. That's exactly what we have found. The mean correlation between the pro-trait items ($mean\ r = .55$) was higher than that between the con-trait items ($mean\ r = .36$), $Z = 6.71, p < .001$, that in turn was higher than that between the pro-trait and the con-trait items ($mean\ r = .12$), $Z = 7.12, p < .001$. Not surprisingly, the mean correlation between the pro-trait items was higher than that between the pro-trait and the con-trait items, $Z = 13.84, p < .001$.

5. The SETLOT's *AVE* ($AVE = .49$) was very slightly under the conventional .50 threshold. However, according to Fornell and Larcker (1981), it was not incompatible with a unidimensional structure.

Parallel Analyses in Favour of a Unidimensional Solution

In a new set of analyses, we repeated the convergent validity tests we included in the manuscript modelling the SETLOT as a bi-dimensional construct, with the pro-trait items loading on Factor 1 and the con-trait items loading on Factor 2. Consistently across the analyses, the fit of the models analysing the association of the bi-dimensional SETLOT Scale with our criterion variables was worse than that of the models with a unidimensional SETLOT. Moreover, with a slight exception, in all of the models both the factors showed the same associations with our criterion variables showed by our single factor. Thus, we conclude that the unidimensional solution is preferable to the bi-dimensional solution.

Association between SETLOT and Attitude towards Immigrants

We modelled SETLOT as a bi-dimensional latent construct, with the pro-trait items loading on Factor 1 and the con-trait items loading on Factor 2. Given their semantic closeness, we did not fix the correlation between the two SETLOT factors, $r = .28, p < .001$.

Like the unidimensional factor we presented in the article, both Factor 1 and Factor 2 showed positive, significant correlations with attitude towards immigrants, measured as a unidimensional latent construct, rs respectively = $.68, p < .001$ and $r = .33, p < .001$. Consistent with the theoretical

reasoning above (see point # 4), the first association was stronger than the second, $Z = 13.52, p < .001$.

The model analysing the association between SETLOT and attitude towards immigrants measuring SETLOT as a unidimensional construct (the results are those we presented in the article) showed a better fit than that measuring SETLOT as a bi-dimensional construct (see Table 1).

Table 1.

Fit of the Models Analysing the Correlation between SETLOT and Attitude towards Immigrants: Comparison between the Model Measuring SETLOT as a Unidimensional Construct and That Measuring SETLOT as a Bi-dimensional Construct

	<i>TLI</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>	<i>AIC</i>	<i>BIC</i>
Unidimensional model	.96	.97	.06 (90% <i>CI</i> = .05, .07)	193.934	194.220
Bi-dimensional model	.96	.94	.07 (90% <i>CI</i> = .06, .08)	261.368	261.641

Association between SETLOT and Populist Orientation

We modelled SETLOT as a bi-dimensional latent construct, with the pro-trait items loading on Factor 1 and the con-trait items loading on Factor 2. Given their semantic closeness, we did not fix the correlation between the two SETLOT factors, $r = .37, p < .001$.

Like the unidimensional factor we presented in the article, both Factor 1 and Factor 2 showed positive, significant correlations with populist orientation, modelled as a unidimensional latent construct, r s respectively = .44, $p < .001$ and $r = .11, p < .001$. Consistent with the theoretical

reasoning above (see point # 4), the first association was stronger than the second, $Z = 10.06$, $p < .001$.

The model analysing the association between SETLOT and populist orientation measuring SETLOT as a unidimensional construct (the results are those we presented in the article) showed a better fit than that measuring SETLOT as a bi-dimensional construct (see Table 2).

Table 2.

Fit of the Models Analysing the Correlation between SETLOT and Populist Orientation:

Comparison between the Model Measuring SETLOT as a Unidimensional Construct and That Measuring SETLOT as a Bi-dimensional Construct

	<i>TLI</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>	<i>AIC</i>	<i>BIC</i>
Unidimensional model	.91	.93	.07 (90% CI = .06, .07)	644.883	645.510
Bi-dimensional model	.91	.92	.07 (90% CI = .07, .08)	696.064	696.691

Association between SETLOT and Voting for a Populist Party

We modelled SETLOT as a bi-dimensional latent construct, with the pro-trait items loading on Factor 1 and the con-trait items loading on Factor 2. Given their semantic closeness, we did not fix the correlation between the two SETLOT factors, $r = .27$, $p < .001$.

Like the unidimensional factor we presented in the article, both Factor 1 and Factor 2 showed positive, point-biserial correlations with voting for a populist party, r s respectively = .23, $p < .001$ and $r = .05$, $p = .093$. The second point-biserial correlation was not significant, but it was not very far from the 0.5 threshold, and the trend was in the expected direction. Moreover: (a) consistent

with the theoretical reasoning above (see point # 4), it involved the factor measured by the con-trait items, and (b) the first association was stronger than the second, $Z = 5.12, p < .001$.

The model analysing the association between SETLOT and voting for a populist party measuring SETLOT as a unidimensional construct (the results are those we presented in the article) showed a better fit than that measuring SETLOT as a bi-dimensional construct (see Table 3).

Table 3.

Fit of the Models Analysing the Correlation between SETLOT and Voting for a Populist Party: Comparison between the Model Measuring SETLOT as a Unidimensional Construct and That Measuring SETLOT as a Bi-dimensional Construct

	<i>TLI</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>	<i>AIC</i>	<i>BIC</i>
Unidimensional model	.96	.98	.05 (90% <i>CI</i> = .04, .07)	91.904	92.080
Bi-dimensional model	.90	.94	.08 (90% <i>CI</i> = .07, .10)	170.396	170.563

Association between SETLOT and Political Conservatism

We modelled SETLOT as a bi-dimensional latent construct, with the pro-trait items loading on Factor 1 and the con-trait items loading on Factor 2. Given their semantic closeness, we did not fix the correlation between the two SETLOT factors, $r = .31, p < .001$.

Like the unidimensional factor we presented in the article, both Factor 1 and Factor 2 showed positive, point-biserial correlations with political conservatism, r s respectively = $.52, p < .001$ and $r = .29, p < .001$. Consistent with the theoretical reasoning above (see point # 4), the first association was stronger than the second, $Z = 7.72, p < .001$.

The model analysing the association between SETLOT and political conservatism measuring SETLOT as a unidimensional construct (the results are those we presented in the article) showed a better fit than that measuring SETLOT as a bi-dimensional construct (see Table 4).

Table 4.

Fit of the Models Analysing the Correlation between SETLOT and Political Conservatism:

Comparison between the Model Measuring SETLOT as a Unidimensional Construct and That Measuring SETLOT as a Bi-dimensional Construct

	<i>TLI</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>	<i>AIC</i>	<i>BIC</i>
Unidimensional model	.93	.96	.07 (90% CI = .06, .09)	109.408	109.666
Bi-dimensional model	.87	.92	.10 (90% CI = .09, .12)	177.018	177.261

Conclusion

Based on the analyses presented in the article, the theoretical reasoning and the empirical analyses above, we concluded that it is preferable to model the SETLOT Scale as unidimensional vs. a bi-dimensional construct.

References

- Curran, P. G. (2016). Methods for the detection of carelessly invalid responses in survey data. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 66, 4-19. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2015.07.006
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50. doi: 10.2307/3151312

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Johnson, J. A. (2005). Ascertaining the validity of individual protocols from Web-based personality inventories. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39, 103-129. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2004.09.009

Marsh, H. W. (1989). Confirmatory factor analyses of multitrait-multimethod data: Many problems and a few solutions. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 13, 335-361. doi: 10.1177/014662168901300402

McGrath, R. E., Mitchell, M., Kim, B. H., & Hough, L. (2010). Evidence for response bias as a source of error variance in applied assessment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 450–470. doi: 10.1037/a0019216

For Peer Review